THEOLOGY

VOL. LV APRIL, 1952 No. 382

Editorial Notes

AN important development in ecumenical conversations is the attention that is beginning to be given to "non-theological factors that may hinder or accelerate the Church's unity". A report with this title appeared in the January number of *The Ecumenical Review*.[1] Ecclesiastical historians have recognized that past divisions in the Church have been caused not only by disagreement about doctrine but by political, economic and racial pressures. It is evident too that Christians are kept apart to-day by these factors and also by psychological obstacles. It will be well if the study of them goes on alongside that of strictly theological questions. Otherwise, it might often turn out that, when agreement as regards faith and order had been reached by two or more separated churches, even more recalcitrant obstacles to unity had been overlooked. Moreover, it is likely sometimes to emerge that divisions which *prima facie* are purely theological are in reality more or less deeply affected by, and bound up with, quite other motives and interests. There is room for plenty of candid self-examination here on the part of all denominations as well as of individual Christians. We would add that representatives of separated congregations in a single town might already be doing useful work by inquiring together in the most practical terms what obstacles there would still be in the way of their uniting, even after agreement on matters of faith and order had been arrived at by the official organs of the denominations concerned. Such an inquiry might cast a disconcerting, but wholesome, light on the present as well as on the future. The headings for self-examination that are supplied in *The Ecumenical Review* will provide plenty of topics for the agenda.

We hope shortly to publish an article by the Bishop of Durham on the Report of the Commission appointed by the Church Assembly on *Church and State*.[2] Meanwhile we recommend everyone to procure and to read it. It is not only an agreed Report; but it is clear, definite, and concise.

Priests who have used *Memorials upon Several Occasions* (first published in 1933), and whose copies may by now be suffering from the effects of wear and tear, will welcome a revised edition, and may even welcome the new title—*After the Third Collect*[3]—which cer-

[1] Published quarterly by the World Council of Churches, 14s. per annum.
[2] Church Information Board, 2s. 6d.
[3] By E. Milner-White, Dean of York. Mowbray, 10s. 6d.

tainly gives a clearer indication of the book's purpose and contents. There is no collection of prayers that is more useful for the purpose indicated. What has been added in this edition is on the same level of liturgical propriety and literary quality as what was there before. The additions include forms of prayer for special services and forms of dedicating memorials and other gifts. The book is well printed and strongly bound.

The editor of our admirable contemporary *Blackfriars* has recently remarked that "the *'carissime frater'* with which the scholastic disputant greets his opponent at each point of the argument is not only a convention: it implies that the resolute search for truth will itself be betrayed if its motive shift to malice or self-importance". We believe that the articles on the Church of Rome in this issue are informed by that spirit, and we hope that they will be felt to be so by our Roman Catholic friends.

The Darkness of the Cosmic Sea

A Study of Symbolism in St Mark's Narrative of the Crucifixion

No fact about Jesus of Nazareth is better attested than his crucifixion. In this at least, pagan and Jewish evidence (scanty as it is) agrees with the Christian tradition. Here we are on the firm ground of historical event. And it is clear that St Mark's account of the crucifixion is intended to convey precisely this sense of historical concreteness. Certain facts are chronicled with a directness that is almost harsh, and with a brevity that is almost ironical. No comment by the author is allowed to break the flow of this bare narrative of events; and yet his reticence cannot conceal from the reader a judgment upon these events that is present in the record itself. It appears most clearly in one sentence, and in one word of that sentence: darkness. "When the sixth hour was come, there was darkness over the land until the ninth hour." It is this sentence that makes the formal division of the crucifixion into its two public stages of action —a former stage of movement, violence, and mockery, in which Jesus utters no word at all; and a latter stage in which words and a great cry burst from him and men scurry about with futile malice. The whole is set within a carefully formed pattern of time—the third, the sixth, and the ninth hours—as if to say that the uncontrolled passions of men are being drawn within a predetermined framework of control.

"It was the third hour, and they crucified him. And the superscription of his accusation was written over, THE KING OF THE JEWS. And with him they crucify two robbers; one on his right hand, and one on his left. And they that passed by railed on him, wagging their heads, and saying, Ha! thou that destroyest the temple, and buildest it in three days, save thyself, and come down from the cross. In like manner also the chief priests mocking him among themselves with the scribes said, He saved others; himself he

cannot save. Let the Christ, the King of Israel, now come down from the cross, that we may see and believe. And they that were crucified with him reproached him.

"And when the sixth hour was come, there was darkness over the whole land until the ninth hour.

"And at the ninth hour Jesus cried with a loud voice, Eloi, Eloi, lama sabachthani? which is, being interpreted, My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me? And some of them that stood by, when they heard it, said, Behold, he calleth Elijah. And one ran, and filling a sponge full of vinegar, put it on a reed, and gave him to drink, saying, Let be: let us see whether Elijah cometh to take him down. And Jesus uttered a loud voice, and gave up the ghost."

At the heart of this narrative there is a mystery; a darkness which seems at first to distract attention from the essential thing, to fill our minds with credulity or incredulity at the most inappropriate moment. A darkness beginning at midday, of all times, and lasting three hours—is this sheerly unnatural or an aberration of nature? Is St Mark prosaically recording the overshadowing clouds, and regarding them as a portent—and if so, what do they portend? Or is he treating with proper reserve three agonized hours of waiting, and yet fixing its character by the word "darkness"? Whichever way one decides, the word "darkness" clearly becomes a symbol, a focus of associations, so that power is released into the imagination, and imagination in its turn becomes a servant of the understanding. This crucifixion—crucifixion which by itself is a brutal commonplace of the Roman empire—this particular crucifixion finds a cosmic setting and is revealed as the decisive cosmic event.

To justify that conclusion, and illustrate it, we must pay attention to the ideas associated with "darkness" when the word has symbolic force. Some of them, of course, are common enough in our reading and our experience; but if we are to understand the mind of St Mark we must be guided throughout by the imagery and mythology of the Old Testament.

Here, as elsewhere, "darkness" becomes almost a conventional figure for death. So, for example, the psalmist beseeches God to rescue him before it is too late, and he says:

> Wilt thou show wonders to the dead?
> Shall they that are deceased arise and praise thee?
> Shall thy lovingkindness be declared in the grave?
> Or thy faithfulness in Destruction?
> Shall thy wonders be known in the dark?
> And thy righteousness in the land of forgetfulness? (Ps. 88. 10–12.)

But there is more to it than that; "darkness" is not mere convention in this psalm. It represents a sense of horror that is almost physical, like being buried alive or drowned in the sea.

> I am counted with them that go down into the pit;
> I am as a man that hath no help:
> Cast off among the dead,
> Like the slain that lie in the grave,

Whom thou rememberest no more;
And they are cut off from thy hand.
Thou hast laid me in the lowest pit,
In dark places, in the deeps.
Thy wrath lieth hard upon me,
And thou hast afflicted me with all thy waves. (Ps. 88 4–7.)

This association of the darkness of death with the sea—"all thy waves", God's waves—is not a literary artifice, but a powerful piece of mythology. We find it again in another psalm—where indeed we also encounter the further symbolic association of darkness with violence.

God is my King of old,
Working salvation in the midst of the earth.
Thou didst divide the sea by thy strength:
Thou brakest the heads of the dragons in the waters.
Thou brakest the heads of leviathan in pieces,
Thou gavest him to be meat to the people inhabiting the wilderness.
Thou didst cleave the fountain and flood;
Thou driedst up mighty rivers.
The day is thine, the night also is thine:
Thou hast prepared the light and the sun.
Thou hast set all the borders of the earth:
Thou hast made summer and winter.
Remember this, that the enemy hath reproached, O Lord,
And that a foolish people have blasphemed thy name.
O deliver not the soul of thy turtledove unto the wild beast:
Forget not the life of thy poor for ever.
Have respect unto the covenant:
For the dark places of the earth are full of the habitations of violence. (Ps. 74. 12–20.)

All this imagery springs from a cosmological myth which finds its outlet not only in the creation stories of the book of Genesis but also in the poetry of Israel. It comes to superb expression when the Lord answers Job out of the whirlwind and says:

Where wast thou when I laid the foundations of the earth?
Declare, if thou hast understanding.
Who determined the measures thereof, if thou knowest?
Or who stretched the line upon it?
Whereupon were the foundations thereof fastened?
Or who laid the cornerstone thereof;
When the morning stars sang together,
And all the sons of God shouted for joy?
Or who shut up the sea with doors,
When it brake forth, as if it had issued out of the womb;
When I made the cloud the garment thereof,
And thick darkness a swaddling band for it,
And prescribed for it my decree,

And set bars and doors,
And said, Hitherto shalt thou come, but no further;
And here shall thy proud waves be stayed. . . .
Hast thou entered into the springs of the sea?
Or hast thou walked in the recesses of the deep?
Have the gates of death been revealed unto thee?
Or hast thou seen the gates of the shadow of death?
Hast thou comprehended the breadth of the earth?
Declare, if thou knowest it all.
Where is the way to the dwelling of light,
And as for darkness, where is the place thereof? (Job 38. 4–11; 16–19.)

Consistency is not to be expected in a cosmological myth; the very variety and indefiniteness of its symbolism is the key to its power, because thus the manifold life of humanity is related to the creative act and the creative process. The Hebraic form has borrowed freely from older myths—the cosmic sea, the primeval monster, the battle of the powers of light against the powers of darkness—each symbol with its partly independent life, ready at any moment to assume various new guises. The cosmic sea reappears as the waters of the Flood, or as the waves that overwhelm the Egyptians. The sea monster becomes Pharaoh, and the enemies of Israel. The forces of darkness are revealed as the heathen who know not God, and Israel herself enters into the darkness of exile. But this characteristic diffuseness is possible precisely because there is an inner coherence which may be discerned even in the carefully elaborated scheme of Genesis, chapter 1: "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth. And the earth was waste and void; and darkness was upon the face of the deep: and the spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters." In other words, God's creative act was performed upon the darkness of the cosmic sea. By the twofold symbolism of "sea" and "darkness" the Genesis myth represents the primeval chaos which was reduced to order by the successive fiats of creation. First, light was created, and it streamed forth to mingle with the darkness; but this new possibility of confusion was at once removed by setting a distinction between light and darkness and naming one Day, and the other Night. This is pictured partly as a spatial distinction—night and day have their separate dwelling-places from which they issue forth; but it is also partly a temporal distinction, for the separation of night and day marks the beginning of measurable time. It is therefore clear that the symbolic use of light and darkness is quite different from the ordinary physical meaning, where darkness is simply the absence of light.

The second act of creation is the division of the waters—represented in the more ancient myth by the dissection of the sea-monster, as in the psalm already quoted: "Thou didst divide the sea by thy strength . . . thou brakest the heads of leviathan in pieces." Here again the central thought is that the raging, irresponsible sea is brought under control. "Hitherto shalt thou come, but no further, and here shall thy proud waves be stayed." And so it is possible for

the dry earth to appear and to bring forth the ordered life of the world.

Thus both sea and darkness stand as symbols of the chaos out of which the universe was created; the chaos into which the universe will at once dissolve except for the continuous creative activity of God. For the power of the cosmic sea is not broken, it is only held at bay. Darkness presses in relentlessly as soon as the light is extinguished. When men perform acts of violence and deal in wickedness they are deliberately destroying the delicate balance by which order in this universe is maintained, and chaos is come again: "They know not neither do they understand; they walk to and fro in darkness: all the foundations of the earth are moved" (Ps. 82. 5). The horror of death is that a man goes out into the darkness; from this ordered life he returns to the primeval chaos.

At this point it is essential to make two important qualifications about the way this myth is used in the Old Testament. First, it does not represent an ultimate dualism. If God indeed is the leader of the forces of light, he is also the controller of the forces of darkness, and he may make them serve his purposes. Chaos is not as potent as order, but out of chaos order may be built. The prophet Jeremiah was commissioned to pluck up and to break down, and to destroy and to overthrow; to build and to plant (Jer. 1. 10). So God himself may unleash the forces of chaos when it is necessary to bring judgment upon his people; and then the invading armies "shall roar against them in that day like the roaring of the sea: and if one look unto the land, behold darkness and distress, and the light is darkened in the clouds thereof" (Isa. 5. 30).

The second qualification is equally characteristic of the Hebraic mind. The creation myth is brought into immediate relation with the outstanding events in Israel's history—the deliverance from Egypt. Let the psalmist speak once again:

> He sent Moses his servant,
> And Aaron whom he had chosen.
> They set among them his signs,
> And wonders in the land of Ham.
> He sent darkness, and made it dark;
> And they rebelled not against his words.
> He turned their waters into blood,
> And slew their fish.

And so:

> Egypt was glad when they departed;
> For the fear of them had fallen upon them.
> He spread a cloud for a covering;
> And fire to give light in the night.
> He opened the rock, and waters gushed out;
> They ran in the dry places like a river. (Ps. 105, 26–29, 38 f., 41.)

Here is the God who controls the waters and the power of darkness—the creator who is at the same time the redeemer. Myth and historical

event are here fused together, so that the event and its meaning are one.

"When the sixth hour was come, there was darkness over the whole land until the ninth hour." At this point also the event and its meaning are one. This is the new Exodus, the second great deliverance of the Israel of God. The darkness is allowed to close round God's anointed as the dark cloud encompassed the camp of Israel. But what is in the one aspect protection, is in the other aspect dereliction. Jesus goes out into the darkness of death, the darkness of chaos. "And at the ninth hour Jesus cried with a loud voice, Eloi, Eloi, lama sabachthani? which is, being interpreted, My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" He was surrounded by the blind wickedness of men and the foundations of the earth were shaken.

The cords of death compassed me,
And the floods of ungodliness made me afraid.
In my distress I called upon the Lord,
And cried unto my God:
He heard my voice out of his temple,
And my cry before him came into his ears.
Then the earth shook and trembled,
The foundations also of the mountains moved
And were shaken, because he was wroth.
He bowed the heavens also, and came down;
And thick darkness was under his feet.
He made darkness his hiding place, his pavilion round about him;
Darkness of waters, thick clouds of the skies.
Then the channels of waters appeared,
And the foundations of the world were laid bare. (Ps. 18. 4, 6 f., 9, 11, 15.)

We must indeed press this word "darkness" back to its original context in the creation story, for until it fits into its proper place there, all else is misplaced. For this moment of the crucifixion is the beginning of the re-creation of the world. Three hours of darkness—and all things are, as it were, returned to their primal state. When, at the ninth hour, the command went forth "Let there be light", the new ordering of creation was proclaimed. Only, it was the Son of Man, on behalf of men, who endured the darkness of the cosmic sea. In the crucifixion there were two public stages of action, one before and one after, in which humanity played its shameful part; but at the centre was the stage of private action—hidden from us by the darkness—in which the Crucified enacted our new creation.

KENNETH GRAYSTON.

Contemplatives in a Secularized World

A COMMUNITY of twelve nursing sisters settled down in a French industrial city. After their first welcome had worn off, they became aware of an atmosphere of suspicion. "Look at the potatoes they get in, and the coal . . ." they heard whispered about them. They were an excellent community, fervent in the observance of religious

poverty; yet their sense of security and their ability to make provision for the future cut them off from their neighbours, uncertain as they were of work and wages, uncertain of paying their rent or buying clothes for their children. The sisters' standard of living was a barrier to their bringing Christ into working-class homes. To bring him to the masses in France requires new missionary methods, like those of the priest-workmen; new parochial methods in town and countryside; and also, so it seems, new forms of the religious life.

The Little Brothers in their house of studies.—So as a crowded bus from Aix-en-Provence carried me on a sweltering day over the last stage of my journey to St Maximin to meet one of these new religious orders, the Petits Frères du Père de Foucauld, I was prepared for something startlingly new and possibly of great consequence to the future of the Church. Three minutes after getting off the bus I was climbing up the dark staircase of an old three-storied house in a mean, narrow street. A knock at the door on the second floor brought me a cheerful welcome "Entrez" from a young fellow in a khaki shirt. Was this a religious house? Inside were half a dozen like himself. You would never have guessed that they were religious, except that one of them, their master of studies, was wearing the kind of dirty white habit you see in the pictures of Charles de Foucauld. Most of the others wore on their jackets a small badge of a red cross and heart. I found that they did not often wear their habit even in chapel. They had whitewashed a small bedroom and converted it into their chapel. There were two or three camp beds in another room, and others in the passages. Their kitchen served as their refectory. That is all they had. Neither their dress nor their home separated them from the poor of the small country town where they were living. Soon mugs of coffee appeared. I told them a little about my community, and showed them postcards of our church in Oxford. Then out came all about their community.

Charles de Foucauld, whom they regard as their founder, was killed in the Sahara by anti-French tribesmen during the 1914-18 war. During his life-time he made several unsuccessful efforts to gather a community round him. But these Petits Frères de Jésus, to give them their official title, were inspired by him, though they were actually founded by Père Voillaume, their present superior, at El-Abiodh in Sud-Oranais in the Sahara in 1933; they were officially recognized by Rome in 1936 and now number over a hundred. The parallel order of the Petites Sœurs was founded in 1939 and has already over a hundred and fifty members. "Except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone: but if it die, it bringeth forth much fruit."

Last summer the brothers had fifteen postulants at their newly opened fraternité d'accueil at St Rémy, not far from Dijon. There they are working on the farms, and they may be soon gaining experience in the factories in the nearby town of Montbard. Every Little Brother, whether he is going to work among Mohammedans like Charles de Foucauld, or among dechristianized industrial workers of a French town, serves his year of novitiate at El-Abiodh.

The Holy See has in the 1950 revision of the Rule designated the Sahara as the "novitiate enclosure"! The whole novitiate with its own camels to carry water, food, and tents, joins some Arab caravan and off they go for some months. There in the immensity and solitude of the desert they are trained to meditate on their trek and to enter upon the first steps of the contemplative life. There too they learn how to bear the hardness and poverty that will characterize their future life in whatever fraternité they may live; and how to enter with an unselfconscious charity and "entr'aide" into the daily lives of those who are without the faith. All the brothers, especially the older ones, seem to have marked indelibly on their faces "the stamp of the desert". After the novitiate there are two years in a fraternity in North Africa or Syria with solid study of the native language and of the milieu in which they are going to work, or else in a fraternité ouvrière, if this latter has been discovered to be their bent. Next follows their residence in one of the fraternités étudiantes at St Maximin, where they have a thorough course of philosophy and theology at the hands of the fathers of the great Dominican convent there. In their vacations they earn their living at manual work. Perpetual vows are not taken until after three years, in certain instances not until after six years, of temporary profession.

Then they scatter over four continents in their fraternities, usually of four to six members: thus fulfilling the desire of Charles de Foucauld, who wished to be "le frère universel" and who said that he was ready "to go to the ends of the earth and to live until the last judgment in order to proclaim the gospel". They are now working in North Africa and in Syria among the Mohammedans: and there, in order to realize their desire to live as close as they can to their neighbours, they have received permission from Rome to make use in Arabic of an oriental rite. Some have made the journey across the Sahara to found a fraternity among the lepers in the Cameroons. Some have gone to Chile. Others go out with the deep-sea fishermen from Brittany, and have to be a month or more without holy communion: others form fraternités ouvrières in French industrial towns. A small group are learning Russian and intend first to work among Ukrainian D.P.'s, but as one of them said to me, "Once you know Russian, there's no telling what you may do!"

With my mind full of admiration for their heroism and their matter-of-fact-ness, I went with them into their tiny bare chapel, where we spent together their customary evening hour of silent prayer. "Cette heure d'adoration est en principe de la prière pure." They were silent and still, kneeling, or sitting on stools, or squatting on the ground. The family on the floor above them were moving furniture about: in the street outside people were buying and selling, children were shouting and playing: but somehow all this seemed not so much a distraction from prayer as an incentive to prayer. "Our consciousness of really being", the Little Brothers are instructed, "the delegates of men before God, and more particularly of those who come to us, those who live with us in our village or in our district of the town, will be for us a powerful aid in fulfilling

our vocation to prayer." Then we said vespers in French, which is the usual custom for lay members of the community: their priests of course say the breviary in Latin. After an hilarious meal and more conversation and then compline in French, they took me to my quarters for the night in the other fraternity house.

I was prepared for simplicity, but not quite for such simplicity as this. It was in so narrow a street, Rue Juiverie, that it had to be a one-way street. The water cart just managed to rumble along it at about six o'clock each morning. Here the brothers were reconditioning a part of the derelict medieval ghetto. What tales that rambling old house could tell! In my cell was a camp bed, a sleeping bag, a straw pillow, a home-made stool, a rickety table, and a basin on the floor. I asked what I was to do with the water after shaving, and was told, "Chuck it out par la fenêtre!": the window looked out into a tiny courtyard covered with straw. I slept well; I was so tired that I could have slept on boards. We were up by six. As we were going to chapel, one of the brothers tapped me on the shoulder, and pointing to my face said reprovingly, "Savon, mon père!" I was as yet inexpert in shaving in cold water without a mirror. We had about a quarter of an hour in chapel for our "meditation sur l'évangile". (The brothers are trained to continue this meditation during their work.) Lauds in French came next, and Mass in Latin; we followed it in our own missals with, as the French say, "much participation", including saying antiphonally with the celebrant the introit, gradual, and alleluia.

A Fraternity at work.—So that I could see a typical fraternité ouvrière in action they arranged that I should visit their brothers at Berre. This used to be a fishing village in a great, almost land-locked bay, north-west of Marseilles: but a Shell-Mex refinery has been built there with its tall chimneys and vast tanks: the smell of petrol is everywhere: uprooted people of all nationalities have crowded in this new sprawling town: vice sees no need to hide itself. There were four of the Little Brothers, one priest and three laymen, all employed as builders by Shell-Mex. And, as at the fraternity at St Maximin, what a welcome they gave to a stranger! Charles de Foucauld used to say that "accueil" and "amitié" were tests of the sincerity of your "adoration". They had acquired a small decrepit house in a narrow, evil lane, put a roof on the house and made it habitable. They have one room downstairs, open to anyone who cares to drop in, with a large table, sink, and stove. One room upstairs has three camp beds; the fourth brother sleeps under the stairs. Two Arabs have made a lean-to shelter for themselves against the back wall of the house. The only other room they have is an oratory upstairs, which with its plain altar and tiny tabernacle is the heart of the fraternity, as it is in every other fraternity.

We went upstairs for our time of prayer. Then, as they were preparing their evening meal, they spoke about their work. They explained that as contemplatives they were called to pray and to offer up as prayer for their neighbours and workmates the hardness of their work and life: they are forbidden by their rule to join in

running philanthropic organizations as some active religious orders do, or to gather around them a group of inquirers and catechumens as the priest-workmen do. Their task, besides prayer, was to help their fellows only on the plane of disinterested friendship. If those who became their friends wished for formal instruction in preparation for receiving the sacraments, they would try to pass them on to the local clergy. (I could not help thinking that this might often be a far from simple matter.) The brothers spoke freely of the difficulties in their life, as I gather they often do in their evening "réunions" between themselves, particularly of their failures to live up to the high standards of charity set before them by Charles de Foucauld. They spoke too of the frequent disappointments they have to meet; perhaps some young fellow seems to be coming along very well, but suddenly he falls badly to the temptations which beset him daily. The brothers said that these disappointments help them to enter into Gethsemane, and out of Gethsemane came our redemption.

By now the meal was ready, and we sat round the long table. As we ate, more and more men dropped in—two Arabs, two Italians, a French colonial soldier with a face as black as pitch, and several very rough-and-ready types. With everyone who came in we had to shake hands all round. Food was running short, so out one of the brothers went to get some more. Poor as the brothers are, their founder-superior, Père Voillaume, has warned them against niggardliness, because niggardliness is contrary to the gracious virtue of religious poverty. "Behold the fowls of the air, for they sow not, neither do they reap, nor gather into barns; yet your heavenly Father feedeth them."

"But why do the men come?" I asked. The brother said that these men would not know quite how to answer that question: sometimes they might say apparently casually, "It is a good place to bring a pal to", or "Coming here stopped me one night doing this or that", or "This house makes me think". These men might not be good at putting that kind of thing into words, but you could sense their admiration and even affection for the brothers. Some of them were, I was told, becoming less sure that there was nothing in the world except what you could see and touch. No sermon, no logic, would move men such as these, but they were beginning to realize that there must be something, perhaps Someone, behind these brothers to make them what they are. Here was the Church at last managing to push out again into a normally suspicious, pagan, proletarian world. At least one member of the party felt closer that night than ever before to another similar group of friends in a similar port on the same Mediterranean: there too "not many wise after the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble were called", but they came to see in "Christ, the power of God and the wisdom of God". It was late when I left the Little Brothers and their friends. They had given me so much to think about and so much to ask about during my last few days with their brothers at the fraternités étudiantes at St Maximin.

The spiritual life of the Petits Frères.—Could anyone except a

spiritual genius like Charles de Foucauld live a contemplative life under such conditions? What kind of ideals were set before them for their life of prayer?

Charles de Foucauld after his remarkable conversion and after his formative years with the Trappists certainly lived in the Sahara the life of a contemplative. He trusted that just by living such a life of contemplation he would begin to win the tribesmen to Christ. He also believed that his contemplative life would be deepened by his welcoming the hardness of the life he would have to live there, and even more by the self-conquest to which he would be drawn in order to live in charity with his rough-and-ready undependable neighbours. Can the fraternités ouvrières make the most squalid corners of industrial cities their Sahara? Can these brothers, by welcoming the hardness of the toil and life they find there and by offering a deep and disinterested friendship to their shifty and dechristianized workmates, be continuing their preparation, begun in the desert, for God's gift of contemplative prayer?

They give themselves neither to any apostolate that looks for success, nor to any self-conscious search for a certain type of spirituality. They aim at giving themselves simply to Christ. Their desire is for "une rencontre très personelle avec le Christ". Therefore they say that their "life ought to tend to simplify itself in a union with the living Jesus, found in the faith, in the eucharist, in the gospel and in their neighbour". They recognize how great is the temptation to-day even for the Christian and the apostle "de n'avoir plus le temps de regarder Jésus et de l'aimer pour lui-mêne". It is, they believe, as Petits Frères, their "role and special task . . . to be as delegates in the presence of Jesus, as the representatives of the multitude who forget God and to present before him on their behalf, their adoration, their needs, their groans, their faults". Through their interior union with Christ their work should be made into prayer, "a silent offering united in a spirit of love to the cross of the Saviour". "It is always in the perspective of a real participation in the sufferings of Christ present in his members that we should see all our contacts with our fellow-men." In the time of prayer itself they should not seek to hide themselves in "methods of prayer" from Christ himself and the starkness of his gospel. All this they grant in their transparent honesty is so far beyond them that it keeps them vividly aware that they are *petits* frères, wholly dependent upon the mercy and grace of their Lord. Yet they are determined to press on in their high vocation. "C'est l'œuvre d'une vie à recommencer chaque matin."

But can the Petits Frères be called in any sense a contemplative order when the outward conditions of the life are diametrically opposite to those of the great contemplative orders of the Church? Granted that God can and does bestow the gift of contemplative prayer on some souls living in the full tide of the life of the world, surely for an order to be called a contemplative order it must place its members in conditions which favour the reception of this divine gift. How do the Petits Frères stand by that test? The classical con-

templative orders of the Church lay down as normally necessary for this gift at least three means, the prolonged recitation of the divine office, enclosure and silence; though it is perhaps significant that these orders vary greatly among themselves in their severity in the use of these three means. With regard to the first, it could be maintained that the Petits Frères recite at least as much of the office as Carthusian lay-brothers. Again as for monastic enclosure and silence, they are not ends in themselves: their purpose is to deepen the monk's love of God, thus leading him towards contemplative prayer. But enclosure and silence do not have this effect if merely passively endured; indeed they might then lead only to mediocrity and egoism. The Petits Frères claim in all humility that the inescapable hardness of their lives and their efforts towards self-conquest in order to love their paganized, unreliable neighbours should do for themselves what enclosure and silence do for faithful monks—that is, deepen their love for God. The Little Brothers stress the fact that their contacts with men are not intended primarily as openings for an apostolate, but as a means of deepening their love for Jesus, present in their neighbours. And these Little Brothers have an enclosure of quite another kind and to many of them this is a truly sacrificial enclosure—namely, the deliberate abstaining from all organized works of charity and also from all organized activities of the apostolate: much as in their generous love of souls they might desire it, there is for them no "relief work", no preaching, no forming groups of catechumens.

As for their rule of prayer, it is a very simple and flexible one. They have their brief "meditation sur l'évangile" in the morning and their hour of mental prayer in the evening; the priests among them of course recite the normal offices of the Church; the laymen are bound to say Lauds and Vespers, though at times they may be able to say more. But they are warned that the mere saying of a cycle of offices can create the illusion of an interior life; indeed, that such exercises passively submitted to may be a danger to the spiritual life. If it should be morally impossible for them to have their full time of prayer on a particular day, they try to make up for the shorter time by the depth and reality of their prayer. They are told that in prayer it is of the utmost importance always to strive for absolute sincerity, and above all to beware of "formalisme" and of the sense of "getting their prayers done". When on holiday or on "short time" or during a strike, they should take the opportunity of spending two or three hours in prayer; otherwise they are no true Petits Frères. In the life of the most hard-pressed fraternité ouvrière set times of prayer are essential; but these should overflow into differing forms of ejaculatory prayer and of offering up their daily work in prayer, suited to the particular temperament and occupation of each brother. One of their greatest privileges is to be "permanents de la prière": there is a play on the word "permanent", because besides its obvious sense, it is also used in the sense of a delegate in trades union circles: and they are convinced that in this they are making their greatest service to their dechristianized fellow-workers.

Priests and laymen.—All this applies equally to the lay members as well as the priests in the fraternities. Charles de Foucauld was himself for a long time reluctant to receive the priesthood lest it should take from him the hiddenness of his life and his desire to take the lowest place. To avoid the same danger the equality of priest and layman is insisted on among the Petits Frères. They have practically identical rights and duties; they wear the same dress; they do the same work, there being no special apostolate for the priest, they have the same spiritual training and intellectual training, in so far as they are capable of profiting from it. The lay members of course have a deep respect for the priesthood; this came out in the spontaneous joy of the fraternités étudiantes, when on the Sunday of my visit one of their members was ordained to the priesthood.

The ordination took place in the great basilica at St Maximin, which is in the care of the Dominican Fathers. There were some fifty men, religious and seculars, ordained through the age-long rites of the Church to the various orders of the ministry. In the choir by the scores of Dominicans in their white and black stood the small company of Petits Frères in the white habit of Charles de Foucauld. Once Dominic and his sons were a mere handful going out from their life of worship to meet and instruct the tempestuous twelfth century: and so the Petits Frères go out into our very different twentieth century to rechristianize it by the offering of their life of prayer. That evening the newly ordained brother asked me to supper with his brethren to meet his family, who had come from Meaux for his ordination. The next morning he said his first mass at a simple altar facing the people in the small chapel in the converted juiverie. We managed just to crowd in all standing up, the new priest's family, his brethren in their habits, and a few local people. After the canon those who were to receive communion knelt and the priest moved among them giving them the bread of life. It took us back to Galilee: "He looked up to heaven and blessed, and brake the loaves, and gave them to the disciples to set before them." And the priest went out from the altar to continue his offering in union with Christ in the world; God alone knows where that will lead him: for he was one of the brothers learning Russian.

S. M. Gibbard, S.S.J.E.

Difficult Cousins

"How am I to answer," asked a faithful member of the Church of England, "when Roman Catholics in the factory where I work boast that their Church is taking the lead in everything?" The question will seem variously apposite according to the area in which the reader of this article is living. Both the article and the question emanate from a part of Lancashire where Rome is exceptionally strong. In the penal days Lancashire was notable for the number of its recusants; the last hundred and fifty years have seen an immense influx into it of Irish immigrants. To the real regret of those in other

communions who see much that was (and is, where it survives) extremely attractive about the older Romanism, it is the ethos of the latter that has come to prevail. The imposing uniformity of the outward structure of the Roman system is apt to conceal the differences of hardly compatible temper that exist within it. It is not guile that produces at the Benedictine or Dominican convent a cultured suavity so different from the reserve which one senses in more ultramontane presbyteries. Both hosts are being perfectly honest according to their half-conscious presuppositions. Again, Rome strong is a very different proposition from Rome weak, Rome parvenu from Rome long-established. It is therefore necessary to discount anything that is written, whether irenically or sceptically, about the Roman question by the limited experience of the writer. The provenance of this article is frankly one where the question with which it begins is here and now a pressing question and the writer one who believes that it will in the immediate future become an increasingly pressing question over a wider area.

Our cousins, if such they be, have their tails up and they have cause. Since the recently celebrated appearance among us of their hierarchy a hundred years ago (an event from which the modern Roman Church in England, in many subtle respects so different from its Elizabethan progenitor, may be dated), they have achieved much, and now a somewhat new technique would seem to indicate that they themselves see the present as the beginning of another turning point in their affairs. St Joseph's, once denominated a Chapel, then St Joseph's Catholic Church, now becomes on its notice board St Joseph's Parish Church or simply St Joseph's Church, while its hall is to be called the Parish Hall. Again, the local Roman Rural Dean may be met with, advertised as the Dean of such and such a place. There are situations in which it will be more profitable to present oneself as the Local Church than as the Catholic Church, more especially when one is jockeying for position to oust another claimant to being the Church of the Land. It will be interesting to see whether the somewhat Italianate architecture lately affected by Rome in this country is abandoned for the familiar Gothic in the revival of which a Roman Catholic, Pugin, played so leading a part. Again, it is perhaps a Romanist-controlled press which has set the fashion for reducing the Archbishops of Canterbury and York to Dr Fisher and Dr Garbett, a practice unwittingly imitated by the Anglican journal in which one would least expect it. These are small things, but it is an accumulation of small things that is apt to count, and there are many of them. One must admire the ingenuity of it and deplore the fact that we ourselves are despising and throwing away the very things of which others are perceiving the significance.

Now, all this comes at a time when not a few provisions of the Welfare State go begging for patrons. It is not so easy an instrument to play as James II, yet an astute musician may use it to give forth his own melodies, until at length perhaps those melodies may come to dominate its scores. There are other ways of capturing England than by evangelistic missions, and it may prove extremely advan-

tageous to those who seek to use those ways that the propagation of not notably successful evangelistic techniques should obsess their rivals. One town councillor, one local government official, may from the point of view both of local and national influence be worth a mint of such exercises. Roman Catholic citizens must be given due credit for, and other citizens should be encouraged to emulate, the excellent work which many of them are doing in such positions, and one who has worked with them would wish to bear witness to their individual fairness. But here comes the rub. Toleration is in our blood. It is not (and this is often a great gain to her) in the blood of Rome. Officially indeed Rome is perfectly frank about it and, much as we may hate what, if reports be true, has happened in Spain, we have been given no reason to expect anything else. Rome in a minority is not, of course, unready to proclaim the rights of minorities, any more than Rome is unready to proclaim the natural rights of parents, when policy renders that convenient. But Rome in the days of her power is prone to forget the laudable sentiments of her weakness and is on her own showing and assumptions committed to doing so. The rest of us have at least learnt to live respectfully side by side. Rome has not, save when it pays her to do so. Everyone else must therefore stand together, undeluded by our sometimes excessive good-nature, to counter the possibility of Roman domination, and it may be a perfectly serious duty of the Church of England to resist encroachments on what remains of her position as the Established Church simply because she is perhaps the most harmless form of Establishment that has ever been devised and there are others less harmless ready to step into her shoes.

That is one side of the question and it is in a sense political. There is another. The question posed at the beginning of this article not only needs to be answered; there is a great deal of thought to be given to the answering of it, for it is also a religious question and in answering it wrongly we may lose our very soul. But first it must be asked why, in so far as the claim that the question contains is true, this state of affairs has come to be and what on the signs of the times will be reasonable expectations in the matter. To this it must in common fairness be answered that Roman Catholics display great zeal, but also that the Roman Church enjoys certain particular advantages, of which the first contributes powerfully to that zeal. Rome in England is intensely sectarian and sectarianism pays. The Church of England is apt to be most successful (and least true both to the freedom of the Gospel and to herself) where and when, and among persons of whatever ecclesiastical colour, that temper prevails. Indeed, it is part of the price that we have to pay for an increased respect for one another that we lose the asset, so conducive to enthusiasm, of having other people to be enthusiastic against. It is one's chief fear in regard to Rome that she will presently drive us into repossessing this hateful asset, but that is a point to which I shall return.

Secondly, Rome in England has the great advantage of being, on her present scale, a comparative new-comer upon the scenes. This

renders her mobile and adaptable. She has fewer roots to pull up in the face of a changing environment. It may indeed be suggested that the Church of England must become altogether more ready to pull up unessential roots, but this is not an easy operation. One may plant out one's chrysanthemums; ancient trees of the forest are unwieldy and a different story.

There is thirdly the supposed definiteness of Rome and the legend, widely accepted, of her immense efficiency. The first thing necessary here is to question these attributes. It is easier to discover what Rome believes about Dr Marie Stopes than about Pelagius, and it was he perhaps who raised the deeper questions. Again, there are most efficient Roman clergymen and also less efficient ones, who are sometimes the pleasanter. But it is certainly true that Rome has oversimplified a number of deep matters, and it is surprising that more of those who are for ever asking for a "simple religion" do not throw in their lot with her. For Rome—and this is a fourth great advantage to her—will at least provide them with a limited program of good works, and the effectiveness of this abundantly proves the benefits which accrue from concentrating upon a few limited objectives. Justification by faith may be the Gospel, but in the world of to-day it is an incubus. It is not patient of the methods of conditioning.

The remark attributed to a Roman Catholic leader that the Roman Church is now more powerful in England than (with the exception of Spain and Ireland) any other country in Europe may be apocryphal, but it is no mere exaggeration. This increase of power is principally due to other factors (some of which have been already indicated) than an increase in numbers, and such increase in numbers as has taken place would seem to be due to a relative birth-rate, and especially the Irish birth-rate, rather than to any startling access of "conversions". That is a matter in which there is a fairly steady two-way traffic.[1] But to a generation that has looked into the abyss of nihilism Rome has undoubted attractions, and it is a further card in her hand of incalculable possibilities that she finds herself, and can present herself as, an Anti-Communist International. On every showing conditions are ripe for Rome to go forward, and it is in that expectation that our proper reactions to the already consequent situation should be considered.

The danger that we shall possibly, and even probably, be driven by increasing pin-pricks or in sheer self-defence to a thorough-going and active hostility has already been mentioned. Such campaigning is happily unnatural to us. It would and should be a last resort, and it would certainly, should it be forced upon us, give occasion to Satan amongst us. Also we should be distracted from those fruitful undertakings for the building up of the Body of Christ in some of which we have been not a little inspired by movements within the

[1] The Roman Church by its exploiting of the "mixed marriage" question has produced the worst possible state of affairs; considerable numbers of young people change their allegiance in one direction or the other, not (in spite of all the instruction that may be given and all the solemnities that they may undergo) from real conviction, but in order to avoid the deliberately fostered inconveniences that will result from doing otherwise.

Roman Catholic Church in France, whose general situation is in many respects parallel to our own. Here much that is small and unofficial but very precious in the way of friendship and exchange might perish in the face of exacerbated feelings.

But it is here and now necessary that our people should be enabled in a spirit of calmness to become better informed about our position as against Rome. It is not a case of occasional polemics, but rather of weaving into the normal preaching and instruction, as the course of Scripture gives opportunity, explanations of what are to us Roman Catholic heresies, to which we should be no more tender than to any other heresies. To the average Anglican congregation the differences between us are largely ceremonial. There is little understanding of what is really at stake. Such information, rightly handled, will in itself be a preaching of the Gospel. The true answer to the question with which this article opened is, "God forbid that I should glory save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ", and our people should be brought to see that such questions are to be regarded as occasions, not merely of self-defence, but of Gospel-preaching or (if we must speak Greek) evangelism. "Thou'd better save thee breath fer praisin' Jesus Christ, like apostles did", cried one stalwart, and here surely was witness in the best Pauline tradition. We have as our great task, not an institution to defend, but a Lord to proclaim. Boasting is excluded and, where others boast, though Satan will tempt us to counter-boasting, Christ Jesus is to be our one glory. Bishop Luke Paget used to say that the Church of England is seen at her most typical in the Prayer of Humble Access. May that remain!

This is, in fact, the crux of the matter. Idolatrous pride (for churches, including our own, can become idols) must not be engendered in wrestling with pride. This also will place us at a great disadvantage, but here our whole understanding of salvation is at stake. There are, however, other and lesser errors into which we are liable to be flustered, among them errors of policy. There are those, especially among the representative laity of the Church of England, to whom Rome is a kind of bogey man, and a bogey man can prove a very useful thing to be, for bogey men rattle people, and those who are rattled are guaranteed to do something ill-considered. When some speaker at a Diocesan Conference holds forth upon what Rome has done, is doing or may do, one may be fairly sure that he is about to propose some large mistake. We do things, either because Rome is doing them (I am not here thinking in the least about the use or the shape of chasubles), or because we fear that, if we do not do them, Rome will. Thus our policies become Rome-ridden. But in any case we may not give way to a sectarian frame of mind; there are roots which we may not pull up; we may not over-simplify; above all, we may not condition. Each and all of these would be for us apostasy. That is not to say that there is nothing for us to learn from Roman methods. It is not in our nature to be good at propaganda, but our propaganda is worse than it should be, and oftentimes appallingly naïve. But those who are seeking to build up the Body of Christ in the sense in which we have been coming to understand that task

will be precluded (though they must play their part in the life of their neighbourhoods) from constituting themselves general entertainers, profitable though such an undertaking may be, both financially and as advertisement. Nor can a sobriety which derives from the Book of Common Prayer, and which is in our very bones, expect to be popular. Even illuminated Scripture texts, where such inducements are provided, can hardly hope to compete in emotional interest with amulets.

In short, there will be programs and devices, proper and effective from the point of view of Rome, but improper for us and also useless, since we can at the most employ them half-heartedly. We had far better get on with our own business, as God commands us, recognizing that there are popularities which, whatever our loss, are not for us. In Christendom we have our particular vocation, come to in the courses of history as strangely as any other, but to be firmly believed in, held in stewardship and put into effect. Far more, there is the Gospel, there is the apostolic witness to him who is the Gospel. If we are faithful to this, we can, if need be, afford with steady nerves to see extravagances and novelties have their hour, though it be to our chastisement, and know that "in quietness and confidence shall be your strength".

FRANK BENNETT.

American Letter: No.12

ROME IN THE U.S.A.

A GENTLY irenical account of the life and thought of the Church of Rome in North America, done by an outsider, is much to be desired. But prejudice dies hard, and a neutral publisher—dependent upon sales for his livelihood—cannot be expected to print a book that might languish upon his shelves for a generation. Such a book would arouse at once the enmity of an angry Protestantism which would hail it as "a sell out to the Papal tyranny", and the anathema of the Roman hierarchy because of the unpleasant realities it could not avoid. Hence we are left with a narrow choice between the lopsided propaganda of bemused new converts and the bitter castigations of a Paul Blanshard whose *Communism, Democracy, and Catholic Power* is a current "best seller" throughout English-speaking North America. Nothing, in fact, could be more difficult than an adequate account of the Roman Power as we know it in the Americas. Indeed, as one thinks about Rome in the west, it quickly becomes apparent that "power" is the one apt term with which to describe a situation in which faith and politics, theology and expediency, have become a solid integration. In demonstration of this point one need do no more than mention the comparatively recent disciplinary developments in which current practice contravenes the Church's historic position as to the nature of Christian marriage.[1] For instance, were the Anglican Bishop of California to solemnize a marriage

[1] A comparison of the pertinent articles in *Hasting's Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics* with contemporary Roman Catholic teaching and practice will be a sufficient illustration.

between a Romanist and an Episcopalian a subsequent divorce would present no barrier to the former's future marital desires, since Rome regards such unions as quite invalid.

Blanshard's book may be taken as a fairly accurate reflection of the fears which have engulfed American Protestantism as it has watched the growth of the Roman Communion into a mighty force of nearly twenty-eight and a half millions of souls. To be sure, much of this growth has been the result of immigration from oppressed European countries; but a notable part of it has come through the skilled evangelistic labours of parish priests and religious orders . . . an evangelism which has taken a full and a righteous advantage of the spiritual bankruptcy into which some of the larger protestant bodies have fallen. In her charitable and educational works American Romanism has accomplished magnificent things. Her parochial schools on the whole are intellectually superior to the state schools in which, too, moral training without instruction in religion has been largely fruitless. Naturally enough non-Roman Catholic parents, disturbed by the evident paganism of the public schools, in increasing numbers send their children to "the Catholic Schools". Hence conversions are inevitable. Certainly, too, the vast network of hospitals, orphanages, homes for the aged, reformatory institutions, and convent private schools with low rates for people with but moderate resources, hold an immense attraction for the unprejudiced and the un-churched; and, by the very compassion of their administrators, constantly win the respect of erstwhile critics. Unquestionably the Church of Rome is the most potent religious force in North America. She makes a powerful appeal to every section of society, from the slum dweller whom she never forgets to the professor who has failed to find the Absolute in the dregs of his test tubes. Thus it is folly to contend that Rome makes her great appeal only to the ignorant and the poor. Conversions of "the intelligentsia" are far from infrequent, and are widely publicized, especially if the convert has been a Communist or an Anglican. This last suggests that neither Anglicans nor Communists are seriously attracted by what my grandmother used to call "the Italian mission".

Rome's propaganda methods are extraordinarily efficient. Of late there seems to have been a notable lessening of the virulent attacks upon Anglicanism so typical of the recent past. Publicity has become attractively irenic. The "Knights of Columbus" are expending huge sums of money in magazine and newspaper expositions of points of doctrine either misunderstood or disputed by the rest of the Christian world. These are written with great skill in the language of ordinary people, and often in terms quite acceptable to Anglicans. For instance, accusations of *Mariolatry* are effectively disposed of in a recent advertisement published in both United States and Canadian magazines. Quite as useful is a policy followed in many Roman Catholic jurisdictions wherein attacks upon the Church are ostensibly answered by lay people. A bishop of that communion (who happened to be a close friend of mine until his recent death) told me that whenever a newspaper misrepresentation occurred lay persons were sup-

plied with "answers" carefully compiled in the episcopal office. This is a sensible practice which might well be emulated by ourselves. Of course, the very size of the Roman Communion in North America gives it an access to the press naturally denied to lesser bodies. After all, newspapers are commercial ventures. An item concerning the doings of the Cardinal Archbishop of New York will sell many more papers than a similar note about an Anglican prelate. But, by the same token, these numbers operate in the opposite direction. Rome's numerical pressure may silence the press when newsworthy adverse events occur. Sometimes this may be salutary when public scandal is involved. Yet a religious body less potent politically and financially could not hope for such treatment. This we have learned by our experience in this area. Numbers mean power, and always great power stimulates abuses.

While one may take issue with some of the statements made by Paul Blanshard, his book is sound enough in its description of what he calls an "authoritarian control over the minds of men". The Englishman, living in a geographically small world in which the Roman Church is scarcely the dominant religious and political power, may find some difficulty in accepting Blanshard's assertion that "the two patterns of power (Vatican and Kremlin) are as alike as the poles of the earth: they occupy the opposite extremes of the *moral* universe, but they represent *the same intellectual climate*—the climate of authoritarian rule over the human mind". And Dr Henry Sloane Coffin, lately Moderator of the Presbyterian Church—a gentle scholar not given to vituperation—reviewed the book in terms which unquestionably represent the opinions of most non-Roman Catholics on this continent: "The book is splendidly accurate and honest. It carefully respects the religious convictions and principles of Roman Catholics, but exposes the whole political set-up of the hierarchy. *It makes plain that Communism and Romanism are twins in their method and their spirit. Both are despotisms, using every device to enslave the minds of men to an authoritarian ideology.* Mr Blanshard is rendering the free world an inestimable service."[1]

Naturally these extreme views have created a furor in the secular and religious press in which neither side seems to have recognized the curious paradox unconsciously exhibited in Dr Coffin's review. There is no genuine dichotomy which makes possible any separation between the political activity of American Romanism and the faith of the Church. Whether or not these grave charges are true it must, I think, be assumed that here faith and action constitute a solid integration. Certainly the bishops and cardinals act in conformity with the will of the Holy Father as he reveals his authoritative interpretation of the faith, and makes his word effectual through an irreducible discipline. Any Christian must ask, "Is it possible to ignore the discipline and yet hold to the faith?" Certainly the Church may err in matters of secondary discipline, but the Papacy is in fact *a temporal power* claiming the allegiance of the heads of States. A whole sequence of Encyclicals proves this beyond cavil. And, if the Papacy

[1] Italics are mine.

is indeed in and of revelation, the believer dare not dispute its claims: the faith is one's ultimate allegiance. This, of course, is the real root of non-Roman feelings towards the Latin Church. In particular Protestantism, conscious of its own divisiveness, is fearful and increasingly suspicious. Perhaps its thinking here in America is unrealistic as it pictures the possible success of "the Roman Power" in so controlling political events that, despite the traditional separation of Church and State, that communion may eventually control the educational policies of the individual States. In fact, this did occur for a time in New Mexico, where, in certain areas, public schools came under the control of religious orders. Certainly the dangers of this sort of thing becoming widespread, or long surviving even in rare local situations, are grossly exaggerated. Yet this fear has issued in a bitter Protestant antagonism towards parochial and other private schools in general, and an increasingly strong refusal to tolerate any religious instruction in the public schools. At the moment in California there is a strong movement, against all private and parochial schools, which seeks to tax them out of existence. Inasmuch as all people, regardless of where their children are educated, are equally taxed for public school support the unfairness of this move is manifest enough. Protestantism may be "cutting off its nose to spite its face" as it strives to bring about the utter secularization of all education.

Of course Blanshard's position has not been immune from sharp criticism by isolated non-Romanists. In a recent number of *The Atlantic Monthly*—not a widely read magazine—Dr Sherman Johnson, Dean of the Anglican Church Divinity School of the Pacific, has effectually destroyed the comparison between Stalin and the Pope. And, in a brilliant article published in the largely circulated (among ministers) *Christian Century*, Dr John R. Scotford—a leading Congregationalist—has offered a constructive program which may be summarized in a single quotation: "If Protestantism is to survive, it must compete with the Roman Church in those areas of thought and life where she is strong. Her past failures and present weaknesses are beside the point. . . . She does not win adherents by the things in which she is wrong, but by the teachings in which she is right. . . . The real genius of the Roman Church is her ability to make God real to the last and the least of the human race. . . . Protestantism will stand or fall in proportion as it leads its people into an experience of the presence of God." These scattered sentences come from a magnificent essay in which the whole theme of the author may be summarized in Queen Elizabeth I's words, "*'Tis the Mass that matters!*" Indeed, the extreme piety of millions of Roman Catholics is not to be questioned as such. Yet the complete integration of this devotion with the Pope as the infallible Vicar of Christ results in the assumption that we of "the outer world" have neither Church, nor ministry, nor sacraments, nor authority to which to turn in time of need. The Papacy in effect is a despotism from which the very faith of the devout will not permit them to escape.

At lower levels one might question the correctness of a statement

which speaks of "the solid integration of faith and practice". Certainly one finds practising Roman Catholics who behave as though the Church had taken no official position on the use of contraceptives within marriage, and this on a wide scale. Certainly, too, one meets devout individuals who, in the realm of doctrine, do not accept the new dogma of the Assumption. The sheer illogic of these positions taken by laymen who regard neither the disciplinary nor the doctrinal significance of the matters involved as of primary importance is of little practical moment. The vagaries of lay people in matters which, in the past, they have not felt to be "generally necessary to salvation" are not to be taken as evidences of a weakening attitude towards the ultimate authority of the Papacy as the voice of God on earth. The *Vicar of Christ,* speaking *ex cathedra,* does exercise a truly despotic power over the lives of 28,470,000 of his children in these United States. To be sure, the Pope refrains from direct pronouncements concerning the internal political affairs of the nation. But the very centrality and strength of his position is an almost resistless factor in compelling the lesser clergy to support the hierarchy's intensive and not always subtle political campaigning. This is particularly noticeable in municipal and state elections, especially in so far as these may affect education in religion . . . when this has to do with the Roman parochial school system. It is quite clear that American Romanism is not interested in religious education given by those whom it habitually calls "non-Catholics". In truth such instruction within the state schools probably would be an accomplished fact to-day had it not been for Rome's determined opposition some fifty years ago. Now, while she would have the States provide free transportation for Roman Catholic children to and from her own schools as they do for all children attending the state schools, her authorities have recently prevented the offering of any prayers at the closing exercises of a public school in the east. This has become the usual policy.

Naturally enough the some twenty-nine millions of non-Roman Catholics are disturbed. Protestants among them, unable to shake off ancient prejudices, sometimes visualize an ultimate papal control of the political situations in separate States where Romanists outnumber all others and, at long last, of the Federal government. This may be fantastic. Yet the contemporary fact of Fascist Spain suggests possible Roman policies should her adherents come into a position of political power.

ERIC MONTIZAMBERT.

Great Preachers—XIV. John Knox

THE controversies that have raged about the person of John Knox as Reformer have made it difficult, above all for a Scot, to form a calm assessment of his stature as Christian preacher. Those who were brought up to reverence his memory as the prophet and apostle of the Scottish Kirk, and deliverer of the nation, tend to think of him hurling defiance at tyranny and superstition and giving to the popu-

lation those qualities of reverence, moral integrity, love of learning, and industry, which we like to think are typical of Scotland at its best. On the other hand, in recent years Knox has been so often cast as the villain in the interminable series of plays about Mary, Queen of Scots, and has had on the whole such bad notices from contemporary littérateurs, that for many to-day his sermons would seem to have been the arrogant fulminations of a harsh and insensitive fanatic. The familiar print showing the preacher in action in St Giles' thus represents for some the Word of God, "sharper than a two-edged sword", piercing the joints of wickedness and corruption; while for others it is a symbol of cruel bigotry directed against beauty and innocence. The fact that the fair lady in the picture could in no circumstances have been Mary (who, as a Roman Catholic, never attended worship in St Giles') is ignored by both parties.

A man who divides posterity into those who revere him as saint and those who execrate him as devil must be a considerable figure, and when the main instrument of his power over his contemporaries happens to have been preaching we are faced with an arresting problem. It would probably be admitted by most scholars to-day that his character has been much exaggerated in both directions, but of the far-reaching effects of his preaching there can be little doubt. In an age when the pulpit partook also of the functions of press, parliament, and radio, the sermons of Knox were not only a religious but a political and social force to be reckoned with in both Scotland and England during a particularly turbulent and formative period of history.

Our judgment on Knox's preaching is conditioned by the curious fact that extremely little material has come down to us on which to base an opinion. Of the millions of words he poured forth from the pulpit (he was almost as prolific as Calvin in his weekly average) only one entire sermon, properly so called, was printed and survives for posterity. This was the sermon he preached in St Giles' on Isa. 26. 13–21, on the 19th of August 1565, in the presence of the young Darnley, the new king who had not declared himself either for Rome or Geneva. This one example is enough to show us at least one feature of Knox's use of the art of preaching which has been of some influence in the Scottish tradition—his use of Old Testament situations to suggest indirectly to his hearers contemporary parallels. When we discover that on this occasion one of his references was: "I will give children to be their princes, and babes shall rule over them,—children are their oppressors, and women rule over them", then we are not altogether surprised to find that the young king strode back to Holyrood in a huff, and that Knox was requested by the privy council to desist from preaching so long as their majesties were in Edinburgh.

This interdiction was the cause of Knox's decision to commit the sermon to print. He desired to justify himself as a faithful expositor of the Word and so re-created on paper the gist of the sermon, taking care, he informs us, to set down in particular all that might have been offensive. If indeed the sermon were longer than our printed

version it is difficult to see how it could have taken less than several hours to deliver. There must have been a commanding personality behind the words to hold his hearers, and at least an inflection of the voice at certain points to awaken the attention and the resentment of the indifferent king. In his preface to the printed sermon he asserts that he has published nothing in twenty years of expounding Scripture "except this only rude and indigest sermon"; and he gives as his reason that he considers himself "rather called of my God to instruct the ignorant, comfort the sorrowful, confirm the weak, and rebuke the proud, by tongue and lively voice in these corrupt days, than to compose books for the age to come, seeing that so much is written, and yet so little well observed".

There is, however, another discourse extant which was preached by Knox at Newcastle in 1550, and published as a treatise on his central topic—the Mass. This is in syllogistic style and reveals to us something of the passion with which he set forth what appeared to him the fundamental difference between the Roman rite and the Lord's Supper of Scripture. The flow of the argument is punctuated by vehement assertion—"Christ commandeth not that we should gaze upon it, bow, duck, and beck thereto, but that we should eat and drink thereof ourselves, and not that we should behold others do the same, unless that we would confess the death of Jesus Christ to appertain nothing to us." But we should be chary of assuming that his insistence on Scriptural justification for all ceremonies made him simply a protester, a negative type of preacher; for he goes on in the same passage—"For when I eat and drink at that table I openly confess the fruit and virtue of Christ's body, of his blood and passion, to appertain to myself, and that I am a member of his mystical body, and that God the Father is appeased with me, notwithstanding my first corruption and present infirmities."

This was also the theme of Knox's first sermon, delivered in the parish church of St Andrew's when he had been called to minister to the besieged garrison. We have only rough extracts of this address preserved in Knox's *History of the Reformation in Scotland* (Croft Dickinson's edition: vol. 1, pp. 84 ff.); where we also find notes of his sermon at Stirling in 1559 (*ibid.*, vol. 1, pp. 265 ff.). With these scanty materials we can form at least some estimate of the nature of Knox's preaching, and of its effects there is abundant testimony not only in his own history but in the course of events.

It is clear that for Knox preaching was no mere addendum to public worship; nor was it primarily an opportunity to give counsel and direction to his hearers. It was a declaration of the Word of God, and a central activity of the Church at worship. The three marks of the Church he had learned from Calvin were (1) the true preaching of the Gospel; (2) the right administration of the Sacraments; and (3) discipline. So when he entered the pulpit it was with a lofty conception of the preacher's function as the herald of the living God. In spite of his evident gifts, his mastery of words, and his trenchant style, he reveals a genuine reluctance to take upon himself the responsibility of speaking in the name of God. He was

summoned at St Andrew's to "take upon you the public office and charge of preaching, even as you look to avoid God's heavy displeasure"; "whereat", we read, "the said John, abashed, burst forth in most abundant tears and withdrew himself to his chamber". That this was no false modesty is shown by his attitude on other occasions and notably by his refusal to publish.

The current conception of Knox as a fervid and egoistic denouncer of all that crossed his path to power or his narrow understanding of the faith, is hardly borne out by the testimony of his words and actions. "He established more than he destroyed", says Lord Eustace Percy. And he goes on: "This surely is the key to the Knox legend. In that legend, as it once lived in Scottish hearts, Knox is not the thunderous preacher, but the restorer of the Sacrament. And the legend is true. His pulpit words have faded, as he intended they should . . . but his conception of the central act of Christian worship set a lasting seal upon the Church of Scotland . . ." (*John Knox*, p. 65). Knox's chief concern in Scotland, England, and on the Continent, was that the content of Scripture should be declared, that the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper should be restored to a central place in the life of the Church, and that worship should be reformed in conformity to Biblical patterns. If in this last he was moved to attack much that his successors have now come to accept we must nevertheless judge his preaching to have been primarily motivated by a positive rather than a negative aim.

If we inquire after what is now called "technique" of preaching, we find that it was Knox's practice to expound a passage of Scripture (more than a verse or two), finding the words on his feet, after having given himself to searching preparatory study. He gives evidence of a scholarship and width of reading consonant with the standards of his time, but is not much concerned with detailed instruction of his hearers, or with dramatic effects. He is the pleader of a cause, the skilful exponent of what he passionately believes to be God's Word to the men of his day, and the scourge of all that seemed to him enemies of Christ.

For the modern reader he is too much given to exposition of the Old Testament, with glancing analogies at contemporary figures. His 1665 sermon contained, as well as the reference to babes and women, an even more direct application of Old Testament story: "Did Ahab correct his idolatrous wife Jezebel?"; and preaching as King's Chaplain at Westminster he anticipated Dryden with his use of the character of Achitophel. We miss in his sermons, too, the concern of the evangelist to win the world for Christ. He tended to accept three classes of hearer as permanent—the "reprobate", the insincere church members, and the "true Kirk"—and to confine his hopes to the denunciation of the former two and the encouraging of the last. But when we have made our criticisms we are forced to confess that there have not been many preachers whose words have roused a nation and left such a lasting effect as those of this rough and canny Scot who spent seventeen months as a galley-slave, braved princes and potentates, and refused the bishopric of Rochester.

David H. C. Read.

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

The Rev. Kenneth Grayston is Professor of New Testament Language and Literature at Didsbury College, Bristol.

The Rev. S. M. Gibbard is a member of the Society of St John the Evangelist.

The Rev. Frank Bennett is Rector of Wigan.

The Rev. Eric Montizambert is Canon of Grace Cathedral, San Francisco, and Warden of the School of the Prophets.

The Rev. David Read is Chaplain of Edinburgh University.

CORRESPONDENCE

RIGORISTS

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

Parochial popes, uninspired orthodox, niggling dealers, dragoons, key-jangling janitors, quenchers of the smoking flax? When your correspondents have got it off their chest, Mr Editor, we might return to calm discussion. For I fear that irony, sarcasm and personal abuse are weapons of the reactionary on the run. If an impartial observer could compare these letters with my large post-bag from perplexed and struggling clergymen in search of a solution, he could have no doubt which way the Wind (if I may respectfully so call him) was blowing.

What are we to make of this "undifferentiated Christianity", the "penumbra", and all that? Or shall we stick to the Old and New Testaments? Did the prophets speak complacently about or act feebly towards something they called "post-Mosaic Judaism"? Did the Apostles regard those "who have gone out from us", or Hymenaeus and Alexander, as having slipped out into the penumbra? Your correspondents speak as though there were only light and penumbra and no darkness at all. In any case the rigorist is concerned only with the question of what is to be done where darkness is diagnosed. And is there no darkness in Wigan, or S.W.11, or in Lincolnshire?

Can some real theologian straighten out for us this problem which Mr Wild raises? If Christ died to save all men *in the sense in which Mr Wild uses the term,* then why have Baptism at all? Are not all men already saved by his atoning death? May I say to Mr Levinge on behalf of all rigorists that it is not the untutored laity who are victims of the rigorist's savagery, but the demos, tutored or untutored. His real difficulty arises from his confusion of the two, which is a prevalent delusion.

May I be allowed to thank Mr Symonds for most of his caveats, which all rigorists would do well to digest, for it is easy to become truculent and even vindictive. But *abusus non tollit usum.* And surely timely action by the few has sometimes leavened the inaction of the many?

Yours faithfully,

B. C. PAWLEY, *Rector of Elland.*

BOOK REVIEWS

THE FALL OF JERUSALEM AND THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH. By S. G. F. Brandon. S.P.C.K. 30s.

In the sixties of the first century A.D. it was still possible for Jews, Gentiles, and Christians, to regard Christianity as a Jewish sect. By about A.D. 140 Christians are the third race, neither Jew nor Gentile (Aristides, *Apology*, ii). How did this change come about? This among other things Dr Brandon sets out to tell us. For him the cardinal event is the fall of Jerusalem. Before A.D. 66, despite St Paul's activities, Christianity outside Palestine had remained subject to the Jerusalem church, and the leaders of the Jerusalem church were determined that Christianity should continue as a Jewish sect with distinctive messianic beliefs but nothing more. The fall of Jerusalem shattered the Jerusalem church once for all and gave the Christian churches outside Palestine that independence of Jerusalem and Judaism which all St Paul's efforts had failed to win for them.

Dr Brandon's theory, so briefly summarized, depends inevitably on the interpretation of our documents, particularly of the New Testament, and does us at once the service of reminding us how uncertain parts of the interpretation of these documents are. In this treatment of the subject Dr Brandon has shown himself widely read not merely in the relevant modern literature but also in the ancient texts, both Christian and non-Christian. Very little has escaped him, and his achievement is the more remarkable as his book seems to have been written during the war and the years immediately afterwards while the author was on the move between Britain and the Continent.

How does Dr Brandon support his thesis? He does it partly by redating our documents. "By the general consensus of critical opinion the authentic writings of Saint Paul are held to antedate our earliest extant Gospel, namely the Gospel of Mark, by at least some twenty years" (p. 3). Matthew "clearly dates from some decades after 70 A.D." (226). "Acts is at least forty years later in production than the genuine writings of Paul" (23). Of Luke and its author Dr Brandon writes, "When he wrote some decades after 70 A.D." (210). A passage at the top of p. 11 suggests that he puts the Pauline Epistles about A.D. 60, and we may take it that "some" means "not less than three". We may conclude that Mark was not written before A.D. 80 and that Matthew, Luke, and Acts, are early second century. It is doubtful whether "the general consensus of critical opinion" in this country would agree with Dr Brandon in the date for Mark, and when I argued that Matthew was written about A.D. 90–100 I did not carry one at least of my reviewers with me whose opinion must have great weight with all of us (Dr T. W. Manson in the *Journal of Theological Studies*, xlviii (1947), 218 f.). Dr Brandon's opinions would be nearer to those prevalent on the Continent, though even there his datings might seem a little on the late side. From his point of view, however, his dating has a great advantage: anything in the Gospels and Acts which conflicts with his view of Christianity before A.D. 70

can be ascribed to the period after the fall of Jerusalem. If we accept Dr Brandon's dating, we must admit his right to do this.

Sometimes the author's treatment of his texts is more drastic. 1 Thess. 2. 14–16 is a difficult passage. It is even more difficult for Dr Brandon because he holds that in the period described by Acts the Jerusalem church in general did not suffer persecution, and so he treats these verses as an interpolation, though I know of no manuscript authority for doing so (92 f.). Dr Brandon does not as a rule resort to conjectures of this kind, but it is questionable whether such action is ever defensible. Our evidence for the text is so early and full and the general fabric so sound that we may take it as a working rule that at all points of doubt the truth is to be found somewhere or other among our manuscripts.

Dr Brandon can read much into our documents. Our information in Acts about Egypt is next to nothing, but, principally from the references to Apollos, he divines "that the Christianity of Alexandria was regarded as seriously different from that identified as Pauline, and was judged as being defective in comparison with it" (26). We must in fairness to the author remind ourselves that his arguments must be considered as well as his conclusions.

The last quotation from Dr Brandon's book brought us to Egypt, and here he does us the service of making us consider, willy nilly, the problem that Egypt presents to us. We are almost entirely in the dark about Christianity in Egypt before A.D. 175. Why is this so? The Rev. J. N. Sanders, whose book *The Fourth Gospel in the Early Church* is one of the very few relevant works which have escaped Dr Brandon, has discussed this question and has suggested that John was written at Alexandria. Mr C. H. Roberts has some interesting suggestions (in the *Journal of Theological Studies,* i (1949), 161 f.). Dr Brandon finds an active church life at Alexandria and infers that Matthew, Hebrews, James, Barnabas, and 2 Clement were all written there.

That I disagree with many of Dr Brandon's conclusions is neither here nor there, but I feel there are two differences between us which are serious. We disagree about what is probable and how to treat documents.

I trust that reading this review will not be taken as a substitute for reading the book. It is a revolutionary book, but that should not prejudice us against it. Dr Brandon is, as I have indicated, very masterful with the New Testament, but his independence may rescue us from too readily acquiescing in a conventional and traditional assessment of the first Christian century.

G. D. Kilpatrick.

Oxford.

Man in the Old Testament. Studies in Biblical Theology: No. 4. By Walther Eichrodt. S.C.M. Press. 6s.

After many years—almost generations—of being asked to view the Old Testament as a source book for anthropology and as being of

chief interest to the students of the comparative study of religions, it is a great relief to find a new stream of books which dare to treat it theologically. Quite plainly the work of Dr Eichrodt is going to be of first importance in this new and wholesome development, and the quality of this small treatise will make many impatient to have his larger work.

Uncompromisingly and from the very start Dr Eichrodt sets out the Biblical testimony to man as being a centre of consciousness under obligation. Indeed, the first chapter is entitled "The Unconditional obligation of the will of God as the basis of the Old Testament view of man", and it is this note that is struck consistently throughout the book's eighty or so pages. We are shown clearly that this sense of obligation which man cannot avoid does not stem primarily from the pressures of life in society, etc., but has an unequivocal religious basis. Even commandments and prohibitions—though they may have direct relevance to the life of society—have this deeper religious sanction. "Transgression of the Law is not only rebellion against the civil community, but also an outrage against God himself." Everything in the life of Israel, even cultus and ritual, is therefore to be seen not anthropologically but theologically. It is what man is in the purpose of God that must determine his view of life, and it is this theme which the prophets, in their various ways, never tire of stressing. Back of all human life is not Law but Will, and the former is valid only as it truly expresses the latter. It is only too possible for men to "handle the Law without knowing Yahweh".

In this book we see the picture of man in his appointed place in the creation and the obligations that rest upon him in consequence. He cannot escape *out* of society and live his own separate life in relation to God, but neither can he escape *into* it, out of God's claims upon him as a person with truly personal responsibilities. Life from first to last, for persons and for society, is bound by an Unconditional Ought, to evade which is to evade life itself. A most realistic line is taken, too, in the chapter entitled "The antinomies of the Unconditional Ought", in which the hindrances to life as lived in the sight of God are pin-pointed. There is the hindrance of the natural life of the nation itself—a life in which man clearly has a part and which can, none the less, come to usurp the place that belongs to his deeper loyalties. There is also the hindrance of natural goods with their tendency to equate prosperity with blessedness, and of course the hindrances thrust in the way by evil in the world and wickedness in the person. This is a chapter written by a realist indeed, and is a passionately honest grappling with the major tensions of life. The only possible criticism is whether the men of Old Testament days really themselves thought as theologically as Dr Eichrodt does himself, or as he appears to think they did.

This is not an easy book and demands close and careful study. Its relatively few pages are crammed with thought-provoking material, and there is nothing than can be ignored if the argument as a whole is to be grasped. It is the kind of book which shows the Old Testament as being the Word of God in the deepest and truest sense,

and no serious student of it—or of the New Testament for that matter—can afford to ignore it.

R. S. Dean.

Emmanuel College,
Saskatoon.

The Kingdom of the Real. An Existential Study of the First Phase of the Fourth Gospel. By Nicodemus. Lutterworth Press. 15s.

This is a sincere, well-written, and in many ways most interesting book; but as a contribution to the understanding of the Fourth Gospel the present reviewer cannot rate it very highly. By "existential study" the author means the "attempt to read, understand, and record what is seen when this book is read as far as possible without preconceptions and primarily with a view to its correspondence with our own actual life-experience at its fullest intensity and depth" (p. 5; cf. p. 95). With such a method, even though the author did try at a previous stage of study to understand what the evangelist "was really seeking to show and say" (p. 5), it is hardly surprising if the book is more enlightening about Nicodemus than about the Gospel. There is perhaps rather more than a pinch of sentimentality (e.g. about the Galilean "idyll").

The author believes that this Gospel "points beyond both the Petrine and Pauline conceptions of Christ and Christianity, and therefore beyond both Roman and Reformation theology, to an age and a Christianity of the Spirit fulfilling and transcending them which are still to come, but, with the decay of those first forms of the faith, may be more near than, in our darkness, we are wont to suppose" (pp. 175 f.).

What he says about time and eternity shows him to be innocent of Cullmann. To the present reviewer he does not seem to take time or history seriously enough. Is not a certain contempt for history reflected in a sentence like this: "There is no conclusive evidence that the portent of His walking upon the sea . . . is intended . . ., but given the assumption that this is a tale of 'aeonion' rather than temporal existence, of history raised to the power of meta-history, the question seems of little moment" (p. 117)? It is theologically instructive that this is combined with a distaste for what is called "Jewish eschatology" (e.g. p. 45)!

Readers will notice Nicodemus's prejudice against organized Christianity—"Churchianity" as he once calls it (p. 78)—and his dislike, or at least suspicion, of theologians. It would ill become us to adopt a superior attitude about this; for the churches have given ordinary sincere people too many grounds for their alienation. But it still remains true that such a prejudice is not an asset in the study of the Fourth Gospel, particularly if Cullmann's views on that Gospel are anywhere near to the mark. So John 6 will scarcely be rightly interpreted, if one is prejudiced against the sacrament of the Eucharist. Pp. 48 f. and 63 ff. indicate, surely, a failure to understand the Scriptural significance of Baptism.

Much in the book is mysticism. Some things that are said seem to safeguard its Christian character (e.g. the chapter on "The Scandal of Particularity"), and yet doubts remain. His views on *agape* and *eros* (pp. 61, 141 ff.) and what he says about the inner Christ, the "Man in men" (e.g. p. 56, pp. 89 ff.), are interesting in this connexion.

Nicodemus limits himself to John 1–4 and 6. There is no index. Misprints were noticed on pp. 65, 107, and 124.

C. E. B. Cranfield.

Durham University.

Into All Lands. The History of the S.P.G. 1701–1950. By H. P. Thompson. S.P.C.K. 42s.

The 250th Anniversary of the S.P.G. has been celebrated with a series of events that have caught the imagination of the whole Church. Great services in St Paul's and elsewhere, the sending and receiving of emissaries, the voyages of the *Centurion*—all these have helped to reveal the greatness of the contribution of the Society to the expansion of the Anglican Communion.

Now comes this story of the Society's work during the past two and a half centuries, which will at once take its place as an invaluable addition to the records of modern church history. The author has an easy and fluent style. He is clearly master of a complex mass of material that covers many periods and innumerable countries. And he knows how to keep the balance between broad generalizations on the one hand and on the other such detailed minutiae as would only bewilder the general reader.

Mr Thompson divides his material into five parts. The first is concerned with the S.P.G.'s birth and beginnings. The second covers the period 1701–1783, when the work was concentrated on the American colonies and directed, not just towards the white colonists, but also to the Negroes and Indians in those territories.

Part III is described as "The Years of Awakening" and brings one to the mid-nineteenth century. The revival of church life through the Evangelical and Oxford Movements and the rapid expansion of British settlement and trade overseas led to a new out-thrust of the work of S.P.G. into Canada and the West Indies, India, Ceylon and Mauritius, South Africa, Borneo, and Australasia.

So we pass to Part IV, "The Flowing Tide" (1851–1901), during which the Society's work reached its fullest extent, passing over from countries under the British Crown to other lands such as China, Japan, Korea, and Madagascar.

Lastly, comes the story of the last half-century, which the author calls "Consolidation", and which includes a fair and balanced account of the unhappy controversy in the Society over its relations with the Church of South India.

What emerges? First, surely, the encouragement of faith. In this story there are some great names, but for the most part there are not many wise, not many mighty. Yet through their devotion, their un-

tiring labours, their endurance of incredible hardships, their readiness to suffer even unto death, the Gospel has been preached and the Church planted across the world. Here surely is the record of one of the great movements of the Spirit that in age after age bear witness to the vitality of the Gospel.

Secondly, a clearer understanding of S.P.G.'s characteristic position as a Church Society. The Archbishop of Canterbury has always been its President. "In the choice of its sphere of work the Society has been the Church's servant" (p. 715). It has been concerned that at the earliest possible moment there should be a bishop at the head of its work overseas—a bishop, too, representing, not just a Society, but the Church. Moreover, the Society has sought to be an association open "to all who call themselves Churchmen", as Bishop Montgomery put it. No doubt the general policy of S.P.G. has led at times to excess of caution, but there is evidence to show that it has meant building on deep foundations—as was evinced in Japan in the trials of the war years.

Thirdly, hope for the future. The rise of national self-consciousness in the East, paralleled by the emergence of missions into self-governing churches, raises a host of problems in connexion with missionary service. Much fresh thinking is taking place at this present time on this subject, and considerable readjustments will be required. This volume makes no attempt at forecast, but its record of faith, and adaptability to varying circumstances during the past two and a half centuries gives hope that S.P.G. will be equally alert and responsive to the changing needs of the coming era.

C. Kenneth Sansbury.

Lincoln Theological College.

The True Likeness. By R. W. Hynek. Sheed and Ward. 16s.

Of likenesses of Jesus, William Blake observed pertinently:

> The vision of Christ that thou dost see
> Is my vision's greatest enemy.
> Thine has a great hook nose like thine;
> Mine has a snub nose like to mine.

Nevertheless one cannot but be interested, especially in view of latter-day discussion of the Incarnation, in Christ's human aspect and experience, where any evidence worth considering can be produced. This is precisely what Dr Hynek has done in his recent monograph (Prague, 1946) on the Holy Shroud of Turin, newly translated from the Czech. It is not, on the face of it, a subject likely to attract the non-Roman reader, which is the more reason for drawing attention to an investigation which no one in this country would be likely to pursue. Nor is it so much the authentication of the Turin Shroud which is here of value (though the traditional physiognomy of Jesus appears to derive directly from this remarkable relic), but the intimate examination of the physiological aspects of the Crucifixion, carried out by a number of continental medical men; in particular Dr Judica-Cordiglia, Professor of Forensic Medicine in Milan,

and Dr Barbet, described as a famous surgeon. The latter went to the unpleasant length of experiments with corpses and freshly amputated hands nailed to a cross in the dissecting room (similar research was made by Renaissance artists in the interests of pictorial verisimilitude). It transpires that the executioners did not nail through the palm, which the weight of the body would tear away, but through the carpal bones at the wrist; as for example in Van Dyke's paintings of the Crucifixion. Thus the whole body hung writhing suspended from the wrists in excruciating agony with the arms racked out to approximately 65° with the vertical. A simple calculation shows that this implies a tension in each arm greater than the full weight of the body (in a 13-stone man the equivalent of $15\frac{1}{4}$ stone). The transfixing of the feet with a single nail was to prevent the otherwise violent kicking consequent on the tetanic spasm induced as convulsive contraction of the muscles spread to the shoulders, the back, and then to the legs. This fierce cramp led to a severe rise in temperature, the circulation was impeded and the right side of the heart enlarged, there was a desperate struggle to breathe, and death followed ultimately by slow asphyxia. Elaborate investigations of the wound in the side have also been made on cadavers to discover the explanation of the blood and water of the Crucifixion.

As the ghastly inquiry proceeds one realizes with growing horror why the mystics have so often concentrated their contemplation on the physical sufferings of Christ, and how appallingly true are the repellent paintings of Grünewald. Thus Richard Rolle: "Than was thy body lyk to hevyn. For as hevyn is ful of sterris so was thy body full of woundes." One recalls, too, the great English devotion of the Five Wounds and the typically English depiction of the instruments of the Passion on Lenten array. Doubtless we have no business in this age of concentration camps to become too delicate to remember these things. Strangely enough, the shroud appears to bear witness to every dreadful detail, though it has a history at least long enough to antedate the scientific knowledge necessary to produce a fake so curiously accurate. Twenty-six remarkable photographs illustrate the text, which give evidence of a majesty about the impression not unworthy of the Christ and which the Vernacle at Rome, obviously copied from it, has already lost. It is certainly impossible to dismiss with contempt.

Dr Hynek proceeds to an interpretation of the burial itself. He maintains (with the support of several scholars) that the *σινδών* of the Synoptics is identical with the *σουδάριον* of the Fourth Gospel, on the ground that the Aramaic form *sûdār* signifies a large piece of linen. The unwashed body, he concludes, was sprinkled over with Nicodemus's myrrh and powdered aloes (a resinous mixture which readily becomes stiff) and simply wrapped from head to foot in the Arimathean's *σινδών* bound in place with *ὀθονια,* liberally enfolding more of the embalming materials on all the linen (the gospel mentions 100 lb.). This seems a reasonable enough picture of the hasty burial, and incidentally provides a chemical explanation of the imprints on the shroud, supported by the experiments of two

professors of chemistry and medicine. He envisages, though without being dogmatic about it, the Resurrection as involving a withdrawal of the *σουδάριον-σινδών* from the expertly wrapped *ὀθονια*, leaving them precisely in place stiffened to the shape of the body and undisturbed, while the shroud was rolled up (*ἐντετυλιγμένον*—which would be a curious word to use of a handkerchief) in a place by itself. It is suggested that the beloved disciple may have been temporarily deceived into supposing the body still there, until he entered the tomb with Peter and saw the shroud, and so comprehended the actual situation.

Clearly the book contains graphic material for Passiontide sermons; and there is much to be said for the upsetting of pre-conceptions from time to time, so long as this is done with reverence and learning. *Sunt lacrimae rerum.*

JOHN H. L. WATERSON.

STOKE D'ABERNON.

SHORTER NOTICES

WRITINGS FROM THE PHILOKALIA ON PRAYER OF THE HEART. Translated by E. Kadloubovsky and G. E. H. Palmer. Faber and Faber. 30s.

The *Philokalia* is the title of a collection of writings by Fathers of Eastern Christendom from the fourth century to the fourteenth. The compilation was made in the eighteenth century and first published at Venice in 1782. Twelve years later a Slavonic translation of this Greek work appeared; and exactly a hundred years later still a translation (with some added passages from Migne) into modern Russian was made. It is the Russian version that is here translated into English.

The subject matter of the five volumes of the *Dobrotolubiye* (to give the *Philokalia* its Russian name) is of some variety, and those who seek to present part of it in English dress must choose some principle of selection. The present translators have chosen those passages which refer to the Prayer of the Heart—the "prayer without ceasing" of which St Paul speaks (1 Thess. 5. 17), and the traditional method of attaining to which is the recitation, until it becomes literally continuous, of the Prayer of Jesus, i.e. "Lord Jesus Christ, Son of God, have mercy on me".

"To call on Jesus perpetually", wrote Hesychius of Jerusalem, who died in 432, "with warm desire, full of sweetness and joy, fills the air of the heart with joyous stillness."

Readers of this book will probably first turn to the explicit directions for the practice of the Jesus Prayer. They will find them in the "Directions to Hesychasts in a Hundred Chapters", by the monks Callistus and Ignatius; and also, with slight variations, in the extracts from Nicephorus. Nothing could be simpler than the Prayer itself, but it is always assumed that those who "think it wise" (as the Athonite writer of the Introduction puts it) to follow this path to

perfection will do so under the guidance of a skilled and experienced spiritual director.

The translators seem to have done their difficult work well, and their occasional footnotes show that they have spared no pains in doing it.

The book contains a reduced facsimile of the title-page of the first edition of the *Philokalia*, and another of the 1905 (fourth) edition of the *Dobrotolubiye*. This book will make many of the treasures of Eastern Orthodoxy more accessible to Western readers and is greatly to be welcomed.

R. M. French.

London.

B.B.C. Hymn Book. Oxford University Press. Music edition, 12s. 6d. Words only, 6s.

Of the making of hymn books there seems no end. The revised edition of *Hymns Ancient and Modern* has but recently been published. Now a new hymn book appears sponsored by the B.B.C. Is there room or justification for a new collection of hymns? In this case the answer must be "Yes". The B.B.C. hymn book is intended for a special purpose: it is to be used in the daily services broadcast by the B.B.C. The thousands who listen to the broadcast services will not need now to refer to different hymn books, for they will find all the hymns used on the wireless gathered in the pages of this book.

It is a good book too; a sober, sensible collection. Here will be found the great classic hymns, together with the more modern ones made familiar by *Songs of Praise* and the *English Hymnal*. Most of the familiar tunes are included, but the music editors have succumbed to the subtle temptation of including too many tunes of their own composition. Another criticism is that the hymns are not grouped according to the Church's year: a hymn book is a composition for the service of the Church, and the Church keeps the Church's year.

But on the whole this is a useful solid book, which admirably and faithfully fulfils the purpose for which it was compiled.

Liverpool. O. R. Clarke.

Deuteronomy. By H. Cunliffe-Jones. S.C.M. Press. 8s. 6d.

This is another of the *Torch Bible Commentaries* now being published by the S.C.M. Press. If at first sight it may seem strange that Deuteronomy should be the first book of the O.T. to be treated in this series, a further glance at Principal Cunliffe-Jones' volume will leave the reader in no doubt about the propriety of this action.

The general plan of the series is followed, and most of the available space is given up to actual commentary on the text, the Authorized Version being the text used. But there is much valuable matter compressed into the Introduction, and here the Christian is shown very clearly the answers not only to questions of authorship, date, and structure, but also to questions about the nature and importance

of the book, its greatness and its limitations. Admitting that "many find it difficult and daunting", the writer claims that Deuteronomy has "a living message for us to-day" and stands high "among the books on which specially we can feed our souls". It is "the religious meaning of Deuteronomy for a present-day religious reader" that he seeks to demonstrate. He certainly succeeds in showing that "this is a great book; and it has had a great influence. It speaks to us in the name of God across the centuries." His final paragraph of the Commentary pointing to the "greater than Moses", the incarnate Son of God, whose Gospel takes up the teaching of Deuteronomy at so many points, contains an admirable statement of the true relationship of the two Covenants. "In the light of Christ the work of Moses is not set aside, or repudiated, but seen in its true greatness, and welcomed as a means of growth in the knowledge and love of God by them which are in Christ Jesus."

C. Witton-Davies.

St Davids.

Why the Church? By G. Bevington. Tyndale Press. 2s.
John Bull considers his Church. By T. Dilworth Harrison. The Bishop of London's Lent Book. Longmans. 3s.

Mr Bevington sets out to answer the question "Why the Church?" in a way which will be of interest to those in their late school or early university careers. He shows the Church as meeting a fundamental need of those who are like-minded, to form groups and associations, for man is a social animal. Beyond this, however, and of far greater importance is the fact that Christ founded the Church and this differentiates it from all other societies. This preliminary examination of the *raison d'être* of the Church is followed by a brief account of its historical development.

Mr Bevington explains clearly in the short space at his disposal how the various dissenting bodies arose, and in his later chapters he discusses the present-day practical work of the Church. He writes: "To-day all Christians are agreed about the truth of the creeds": this may be true, but they surely differ on the way in which the creeds should be formulated. The name of John Hus, which is mentioned in his historical survey, is more usually associated with Bohemia than with Hungary. Some readers may think that the work of the Oxford Movement is somewhat sparsely treated, as compared with Quakerism for instance. These, however, are minor criticisms in what should prove to be a valuable addition to the series "Foundations of Faith".

Archdeacon Dilworth Harrison's book is intended to be used in connexion with the schools of religion set up as a result of the mission to London. It will, however, be highly acceptable to a much wider circle. The first part, historical, sets out clearly the vicissitudes of the life of the Church in this country. The author has a remarkable ability for compressing a great deal into a few graphic sentences, and he deals with the abuses of some eras in ecclesiastical

history scientifically and without obtruding moral judgments. His aim is, in fact, to show that though the treasure is in earthen vessels it has never been really lost; that again and again the Spirit breathed and the "dry bones" lived. Thus as the Bishop of London says, the first section is "a cordial for drooping spirits".

The second half of the book is concerned with foundations; the Bible and its themes, the problem of suffering, and the sacraments. Many will be familiar with these themes, but the Archdeacon writes freshly and enthusiastically and has a large number of interesting things to say. The author in his introduction says he is writing to reach "simple people" and there is no doubt that his lucidity will enable him to do so.

M. G. Tucker.

Colston's School,
Bristol.

Studiorum Novi Testamenti Societas. Bulletin II. Oxonian Press, Oxford. 5s. 6d., post free.

This bulletin contains four papers that were given at the September 1951 meeting of the S.N.T.S.—namely, (i) "A Problem of Interpretation" (i.e., the relation between the theological and historical approaches to the N.T.), by Prof. C. H. Dood; (ii) "The Western Text and the Theology of Acts", by Prof. P. H. Menoud; (iii) "Some Observations on the Semitic Background of the New Testament", by Prof. H. F. D. Sparks; and (iv) "What was the Ascension?" by Prof. A. M. Ramsey.

Parish Magazines generally make depressing reading. Often the only joy they bring comes through an occasional misprint—as when a vicar began his Parish Letter "My dead friends". However, here is an exception. It is *The Vale Churchman*, the magazine of twelve parishes of which Tewkesbury is the centre. It has sixteen large pages, it is printed on good glossy paper in a clear attractive type, and it costs sixpence. Even the advertisements, which to-day are strictly necessary, do not obtrude.

The editor and his staff desire to give their readers a vision of the Church not bounded by parish borders. A Church Commissioner, a prison chaplain, and a religious are included among the contributors to a series on "My Job"; there is a prickly and provocative series called "If I had my way"; there are articles on local churches and a calendar which seems really concerned with people's prayers. Of course, there are accounts of choir outings and jumble sales—people are interested in them and properly so—yet here they take their right place.

This magazine has answered the problem of the small parish and its magazine with great success, and without recourse to a deanery digest complete with inset. The fact that the first number was good and the second better leads one to hope that here is a place where

the Church will be able to show forth its good news in the printed word, in a manner both attractive and intelligent.

The editor of *The Vale Churchman* is the Rev. P. N. Harvey, Ash Church Rectory, Tewkesbury, Gloucestershire.

WESTCOTT HOUSE, CAMBRIDGE. W. J. WESTWOOD.

LIFE IN THE EARLY CHURCH A.D. 33 TO 313. By A. E. Welsford. N.S. and S.P.C.K. 15s. (also paper cover in two parts 6s. each).

This is a first-rate book and will serve an extremely useful purpose. Though covering a shorter period, it is even better done than Bevil Browne's *The Way and the Faith,* which hitherto might have been placed in a class by itself as an introduction to the history of the early Church. Miss Welsford does indeed make the early Church live for her readers, without any romancing or superficiality. She does this by her knowledgeable and skilful use of the original documents; hardly any of her 400 pages are without a quotation from the literature of the times. Many pages, too, have useful drawings of contemporary interest, and the book is worth all the 15s. it costs in these expensive days. How important it is that not only teachers, for whom this book is primarily intended, but also all thinking Christians, young and old, clerical and lay, should know their early Church! There has too long been a gap at this point; yet the survival of the Church in the first three centuries is perhaps the strongest evidence for the truth of the Resurrection; indeed, without the Church the Gospel does not make sense, and without it, of course, the New Testament would never have been written, and in those centuries the pattern of the Church's life was hammered out. Many must be conscious of the gap: here is something both reliable and readable to fill it, and point the way to further study. This is a book for any library, school, parish or public, and for the book token list too.

TOTTENHAM. J. H. CHURCHILL.

FORTY YEARS AND AN EPILOGUE. By Stephen Hobhouse. James Clarke and Co. 12s. 6d.

Stephen Hobhouse will be best known to readers of THEOLOGY as the editor of William Law's mystical writings. Born in 1881, and heir to a landed estate, his life would have differed little from that of many other Old Etonians had he not experienced a Tolstoyan conversion when at Oxford. His intense seriousness prevented this experience from being a passing enthusiasm. It changed the whole course of his life. His autobiography is a story of dedication to unpopular causes, and illustrates both the virtues and the limitations of a scrupulous idealism. His life would have been happier if he had enjoyed more robust health and had had a wider range of interests, including some frivolous ones. His moralizing would be more persuasive if he had a keener sense of humour.

THE FAITH OF ST PAUL. By W. R. Inge. S.P.C.K. 2s. 6d.

Thirty years ago it was accounted orthodox to read St Paul in order to study his religious experience and to wear Greek spectacles while doing so. It is a melancholy thing to find that same orthodoxy, unaware that it is a ghost, inspiring a lecture delivered in 1951.

F. C. S.

The second number of *Lumière et Vie* (February, 1952) is devoted to a series of articles on the Apostles' Creed. This is a promising new theological periodical, which is edited by Père A. Grail, O.P., and can be obtained from the Collège Théologique Dominicain at Saint-Alban-Leysse, Savoie, France.

The March, 1952, number of the *Scottish Journal of Theology* contains a long review by Dr T. F. Torrance of *The Fulness of Christ* (the report of a group of Anglican evaneglicals to the Archbishop of Canterbury), in which he raises some important questions about the part that the Church of England is qualified to play in the movement towards church union.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(Mention here neither implies nor precludes subsequent comment.)

BURNS OATES: B. Menczer, *Catholic Political Thought 1789–1848* (18s.).

CAREY KINGSGATE PRESS: L. G. Champion, *The Church of the New Testament* (7s. 6d.).

FABER AND FABER: Bernardino de Laredo, *The Ascent of Mount Sion* (21s.).

INDEPENDENT PRESS: G. F. Nuttall, *The Reality of Heaven* (6s.).

LUTTERWORTH PRESS: W. E. Soothill, *The Hall of Light* (25s.); C. Quin, *The Ten Commandments* (15s.); W. H. Rigg, *The Fourth Gospel and its Message for To-day* (15s.).

MOWBRAY: H. Hancock, *Transatlantic Exchange* (3s. 6d.); S. M. Bicester, *The Way, the Truth, and the Life* (3s.); *Lenten Counsellors: a catena of Lent sermons for devotional reading* (5s.); S. P. T. Prideaux, *The Cross of Unity* (Addresses on the seven words from the Cross) (2s. 6d.); *St Anselm: Prayers and Meditations* (3s.); *The Founders of Clewer* (4s. 6d.).

OVERDALE COLLEGE, BIRMINGHAM: E. C. Rust, *Preaching in a Scientific Age* (1s. 6d.).

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS: W. N. Pittenger, *The Christian Sacrifice* (21s.).

S.C.M. PRESS: G. L. Heawood, *Vacant Possession* (8s. 6d.); R. P. C. Hanson and J. D. MacCaughey, *The Church's Unity* (6d.).

S.P.C.K.: P. G. Lindhardt, *Grundtvig* (21s.); E. D. K. Wood, *The Holy Name* (6s. 6d.); M. U. J. Seaborne, *The Reformation in Wales* (3s. 6d.); Anon., *Priest Workman in England* (10s. 6d.); H. R. T. Brandreth, *Dr Lee of Lambeth* (21s.); F. Goldie, *A Short History of the Episcopal Church in Scotland* (14s. 6d.).

SPEMANN VERLAG (STUTTGART): Günther Roeder, *Volksglaube im Pharaonenreich* (n.p.).

TYNDALE PRESS: F. D. Kroner, *Sacrifice in the O.T.* (2s.); E. W. Crabb, *Men on the Tower* (1s. 6d.).

Printed in Great Britain by
Billing and Sons Ltd., Guildford and Esher